



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT HOMERIC LITERATURE

BY A. SHEWAN

The history of the Homeric Question since the close of last century may be summed up in one word, Reaction. "The pendulum has swung back," says one authority. The general feeling, "whether we like it or not," says another, is in favor of unity of authorship. Homerists are now persuaded that there was, after all, a Homer, however they may differ as to his *floruit* and his share in the final construction of the epics.

The fight has "swayed oft this way and that" since the days of Wolf. But toward the end of the last century there was something like agreement among the dissectors of the poems, that these had each grown from a *Kern* or nucleus by enlargements through long ages. As to the limits of the kernel and manner of growth, there was still infinite variety of opinion. But the proper solution had been reached, and those who held the antiquated view of unity were "not to reason with" and only to be pitied as the victims of a foolish *φειλοστοργία*. Blass, however, had the hardihood to disregard it for the *Odyssey*. For the *Iliad* the first protest was made by Wilamowitz. He was followed in revolt by Wecklein, Mülder, and others, who affirmed that the sacrosanct *Mēnis* or Wrath was not primeval, but only a modern *motif* used to bind together pre-existing lays, by some considered an *Iliad*, by others a less coherent mass. And so the *Kern* theory is passing into oblivion. Times are changed when Drerup objects—for Germany at least—to Mr. Lang's description of it as the popular view.

The causes of this revulsion are well ascertained. Excavation and sober research have brought us nearer to a real arena and a possible *floruit* for the life of the poems, and have given tradition a place in serious discussion. Pisistratus has had his day as maker of the epics. Concurrently, there arose in the minds of men something like disgust at the excesses of Homeric criticism. The methods of dissection were seldom challenged. So *Hybris* ruled, τὸν Δι'

ἐξελλακώς. A monstrous, imaginary regiment of interpolators, diaskeuasts, redactors, and *Bearbeiter*s was postulated, with plenary powers over the poems. They were mostly fools; there was an apotheosis of the *Stümper* or duffer. Interpolations were argued on the flimsiest ground, and emendation used in a manner that was flagrant in its arbitrariness. Anything that could be called a "peculiarity" was reason for arguing the interposition of some late, degraded worker. And so a sort of hysteria stage was reached. Fick's *Zahlenspielen*, Robert's "Ionisms," and Professor Murray's "Expurgation" are examples. *Die grassierende Epidemie der Entstehungstheorie den gesunden Menschenverstand unheilbar verseucht hat* (Mülder, *B. ph. W.*, 1910, 65).

The feeling now prevailing is that voiced by van Leeuwen (*Mnemos.*, XXXVIII, 341)—*quam primum emergendum est e dubitationum et suspicionum illa palude, in qua nimis diu haeserunt studia HomERICA*. That inquiry continued on such lines for nearly a century is a curiosity in the history of the mind of learned Europe. There have always been protestants, notably Rothe in Germany and Lang in England. They had a hard fight; *tantae molis erat*. But they have triumphed against a host. The *Liederjagd* and *Kerntheorie* are now "creeds outworn." Saner principles have won the day, as will be seen in nearly every section of the review which follows. Destructive criticism had gone too far; it had, as Croiset puts it (*Rev. d. deux Mondes*, 1907, 625), "succeeded too well." The supineness of the Unitarians has proved fatal encouragement.

To begin with the *Iliad*. The century opened with Robert's *Studien* (1901), a great attempt to reach the kernel. It will probably be the last, for it was a complete failure. The acuteness and erudition of its author were warmly acknowledged by the reviewers; the method and results were as generally condemned. Fick's *Das alte Lied vom Zorn Achills* (1902) was not seriously regarded (cf. Drexler, *Omero*, 215 n.), and Gruss's *Lied vom Zorne des Achilleus* (1910) is from "the obsolete standpoint of fifty years ago" (Rothe, *Jahresb. d. philol. Ver.*, 1910, 384). Miss Stawell's *Homer and the Iliad* (1909) marks a great advance on all such analyses. The "Original *Iliad*" is there exhibited in dimensions which must have appalled enucleators of the old school, and is, moreover, assigned to the author of the

Odyssey. This is the result of a reasoned disregard of stereotyped skeptical methods, and of a fine appreciation of literary considerations which has won the admiration of the critics, among them Professor Murray, though he was aghast at the authoress' boldness in attacking, and demolishing, the theory of the "*Odysseanism*" of certain parts of the *Iliad*. Miss Stawell has since increased the area of her Original *Iliad* (Rothe, *loc. cit.*), but will not yield (*C.R.*, XXV, 75 ff., 167 ff.) to the powerful arguments of Mr. Lang regarding the *Embassy*. On that point the fight must continue. Professor Scott is shortly to show further cause for the retention of the ninth book of the poem.

The discomfiture of the *Kern* school was assisted by a flank movement that dates from 1895. A hint by Wilamowitz in the *Göttinger Nachrichten* of that year (cf. Cauer, *Grdfgrn.*, 304 n., and Rothe, *Jahresb. d. philol. Ver.*, 1909, 224) did not fructify at once. But a few years later came a stream of treatises all tending to question the primordial nature of the *Mēnis*. See Ludwig, *Die Unmöglichkeit einer Urilias*, 1901; Gercke, *N. Jbb.*, 1901, 83 ff.; Cauer, *ibid.*, 1902, 98; Girard's "Comment a dû se former l'Iliade," in *Rev. d. Études grecques*, 1902; Wecklein's *Studien zur Ilias*, 1905; Müllder's *Homer u. d. altion. Elegie*, 1906, and Finsler's *Homer*, 1908. Here was a *bouleversement*. For years arguments, especially from language, had been accumulated to prove that the Wrath was of hoary age and the foundation of the *Iliad*. Now a new nucleus must be suggested or the hunt abandoned. We have seen what Drerup thinks.

And yet another successful blow was struck for the unity of the *Iliad*. It had long been one of the *choses jugées* of disintegrating criticism that I, K, Ψ, and Ω had been finally discredited as "Odyssean" and "Neozoic." This belief has also failed to stand the test. See the refutation in Miss Stawell's work, Professor Scott's papers in *C.P.*, V, 41 ff., 68 ff., Rothe in *Jahresb.*, 1910, and *C.Q.*, IV, 73 ff., 228 ff.

It is probably a result of these shocks that essays directed against individual parts of the poems have been less frequent than formerly. Deecke's *De Hectoris et Aiakis certamine* (1906), still relies on the *Bearbeiter*. Czyczkiewicz, *Agamemnon's Bestrafung* (1907), suggests

that the first and second books are the *Kern* or groundwork. Bethe's *Hektors Abschied* (1909) has a word of praise from Murray (*R.G.E.*,² pref.), but is condemned by Müllder (*B. ph. W.*, 1911, 761 ff.), van Leeuwen (*Mnemos.*, 1910, 338 ff.), and Rothe (*Jahresb.*, 1910, 389 f.), and criticized by Cauer (*D.L.Z.*, 1910, 1447 f.). The critics find it hard to reconcile Bethe's results with the "artistic will" to which he ascribes the *Iliad*. Wilamowitz, *Über das Θ der Ilias* (1910), has a new theory of the much-abused eighth book, on which see Rothe, *Jahresb.*, 1910, 388, and *C.P.*, VI, 37 ff. Professor Verrall, in "The Mutiny of Idomeneus" (in *The Bacchants of Euripides and Other Essays*, 1910), assumes a harmonizer, who is incapable and clumsy and who has left traces, and the existence of different "versions" of the *Iliad*, and provides the Cretan leader with a *mēnis* of which there is no other sign in Greek literature. The author follows closely the results in Dr. Leaf's *Iliad*, a great work, but one the *critical* value of which has been variously estimated by British scholars. Parallel "versions" are also assumed in L. Adam's *Unsicherheit literar. Eigentums bei Griechen u. Römern* (1906). K. Witte's *Singular u. Plural* (1907) adds one to a long, discordant, and curious list of distributions and enucleations of the poem by various tests.

And as efforts on the old lines become fewer and weaker, the positive declarations in favor of unity become stronger and more frequent. The *Volksgeist* and the *Redactor* are forgotten, and Criticism works on a higher plane. In France Bréal, *Pour mieux connaître Homère* (1906), and van Gennepe, *La question d'Homère*, and in Germany Müllder, in *Die Ilias u. ihre Quellen* (1910) and many reviews, have proclaimed the essential unity of the *Iliad*. So in Britain, Mr. Andrew Lang in *Homer and His Age* (1906) and *The World of Homer* (1910), and Professor Mackail in his *Lectures on Greek Poetry* (1910). In Holland van Leeuwen, a scholar who yields to none in his knowledge of the poems, now avows himself a stout believer ("De Iliadis Compositione," *Mnemos.*, 1910, 354 ff. = *Commentationes Homericae*, 1 ff.). In the same periodical, 1911, he has given two instalments of a formal *Locorum Homericorum qui immerito vituperati sunt Defensio*,¹ which will no doubt prove a salutary cor-

¹ Completed in the issue for 1912.

rective of the license which has been popular in the past. Compare Scott on the "Athenian Interpolations" in *C.P.*, VI, 419 ff. Lillge's *Komposn. u. poet. Technik der Διομήδους Ἀριστεία* (1911) is a serious attempt to understand the episode as a whole and the poet's object in composing it, without utilizing the *Künste des Änderns u. Tadelns* or the assumption of contamination by *Stümper*s. A useful list is given of works which depend on new and improved methods of interpretation. To these will soon be added a new appreciation of this same book (E) by Drerup. And lastly, Rothe's *Die Ilias als Dichtung* (1910) crowns the work of thirty years in the same interest. Its many reviewers have hardly a word to say against it. It is significant that Hennings (*B. ph. W.*, 1911, 449 ff.) finds little to criticize adversely.

There is a discordant note in Professor Murray's *Rise of the Greek Epic* (1907, 2d ed., 1911), the main theses of which are that the *Iliad* (the *Odyssey* is hardly touched) is a "particular version or remaniement" of a Traditional Book, the composers of which are legion, and that the absence from it of the gross elements which disfigure the Cyclics and Hesiod is due to a process of "expurgation." This latter theory, which Mr. Lang (*Oxf. Mag.*, 1911) describes as the cornerstone of the Professor's structure, has practically nothing to support it (see especially *Times Lit. Suppl.*, 1908, 99), and is not accepted by any reviewer known to me.¹ See *C.R.*, XXII, 187 ff., *C.P.*, IV, 222 ff., and VI, 238 ff.; *W. kl. Phil.*, 1908, 630 ff.; *B. ph. W.*, 1909, 225 ff.; *D.L.Z.*, 1908, 2467 ff.; *Sat. Rev.*, 1911, 51; *Spectator*, 1907, 1055 f., and *Athenaeum*, 1908, No. 4203. Add Drerup (*Omero*, 68 n. and 238 n.; cf. *W. kl. Phil.*, 1911, 453), who prefers to depend on the analogy—in *pari materia*—of the epic poetry of other nations. The Old Testament, even with all the "assured results" of the Higher Criticism, and the Pseudo-Callisthenes are poor substitutes. For the rest, the critics admit the cleverness and readableness of the book. The best is made of a rash hypothesis. As Professor Shorey says, it is a fascinating account of how the thing might have happened. But there is no evidence

¹A review by Bury, said to be favorable, I have been unable to discover. Since writing the above I see that Stobart, in his recently published work, *The Glory That Was Greece*, p. 42, accepts traces ("to the sharp eye") of expurgation.

that it did fall out so. Instead of proof, we have, as one reviewer puts it, free *Phantasieren*. The author οὐ σοφία ἀλλὰ φύσει τινὶ καὶ ἐνθουσιάζων ποιεῖ.

For the *Odyssey*, the only serious shock has been from Kirchhoff's assault. It impressed many. Some, as Fick, adhered wholeheartedly; others, as Seeck and Wilamowitz, with modifications. The component elements of the poem were well ascertained, and *Nostos*, *Gegennostos*, *Phäakis*, *Tisis*, *Bogenkampf*, *Verwandlung*, *Telemachy*, *Nekyia*, were familiar as household words in the mouths of Homerists, who arranged and rearranged the pieces of the puzzle in many combinations. But the more that changed, the more that remained the same thing in essence—a host of poets, with subsidiary meddlers, and the final, late, incompetent *Bearbeiter*.

Kirchhoff's scheme was never a full success. His results were soon challenged—by Kammer, Heimreich, Schmidt, Niese, and by Rothe in his *De vetere ΝΟΣΤΩΙ* and his various reports on Homer. In Britain Jebb admired and hesitated. Monro was not convinced; the *Telemachy* especially could never have had independent existence. And now men are free to believe again in an indivisible *Odyssey*. In Gildersleeve's words (*Am. J. Phil.*, 1908, 499), "the palpitating life of Homer has broken Kirchhoff's bands asunder and cast away his cords from it." Yet Homerists will ever remember his work with gratitude for the soundness of its method, as they remember Fick's defunct Aeolic hypothesis for its quickening of the study of the Homeric language.

Among the irreconcilables, Fick has reasserted his views in his *Entstehung* (1910), which has been sharply criticized (*C.R.*, XXV, 20 f.; *C.P.*, VI, 236 ff.; *Omero*, 218 n.; *B. ph. W.*, 1910, No. 29, and Hennings, *W. kl. Phil.*, 1910, 481 ff.). The last named takes a position of his own, which he maintains with much ability and knowledge, in his *Homers Odyssee* (1903) and *Jahresb. d. philol. Ver.*, 1906, 260 ff. (cf. Rothe, *ibid.*, 1903, 297 ff.; also *N. Jbb.*, 1904, 734; *W. kl. Phil.*, 1904, 785 ff.; *B. ph. W.*, 1904, 1313 ff., and *C.R.*, XIX, 359). Of the latest reconstruction,¹ Schiller's in his *Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung d. Od.* (1907–8) and in *B. ph. W.*, 1910, 92 ff., the critics have left but little. Cf. Stürmer, *ibid.*, 97 ff., *Z. f. d. öst.*

¹ A still later one now is Adam's *Aufbau d. Od. durch Homer* (1911).

Gym., 1910, 385 ff., and *Wiener Stud.*, 1911, 161 ff.; also *W. kl. Ph.*, 1908, 485 ff., *Omero*, 74 n., Rothe, *Jahresb.*, 1907–10, and Draheim, *Odyssee*, 4 ff. Individual elements are discussed by Müllder, whose views have probably since developed toward unity, in his analyses of μ and κ (*Philol.*, LXV, 193 ff.), and papers on the *Kyklopeia* (*Hermes*, 1903, 414 ff.) and the *Phäakendichtung* (*N. Jbb.*, 1906, 10 ff.). The two last are replied to by Wilder in *Wiener Stud.*, XXVIII, 84 ff., and Stürmer in *Z. d. öst. Gym.*, 1907, 481 ff. Similar studies are Trenkel's on *Phäakis u. Telemachie* (1903), Rossner's *Zur Komposn. d. Od.* (1904), and Lillge's on the *Nekyia* (*Z. f. d. Gymnasial W.*, 1911, 65 ff.). L. Adam's *Ursprüngliche u. echte Schluss d. Od.* (1908) is in continuation and in the sense of his series of well-known treatises. Groeger's "Einfluss d. Ω auf d. Composn. d. Od." (*Rhein. Mus.* 1904, 1 ff.) is an industrious compilation of the similarities between the poems, with which no one need quarrel. For Berger's *De Il. et Od. partibus recentioribus* (1909) see Müllder in *B. ph. W.*, 1910, 65 ff.

For the rest, the record is a proclamation of the old orthodox view. There is general agreement in the following that, excepting a few accretions and interpolations, the poem is the product of one poetical genius—Monro (*Odyssey*, 1901); Wetzel (*Betrachtgn. üb. Homers Od. als Kunstwerk*, 1901); Sitzler (*Ästh. Kommentar*, 1902); Drerup (*Homer*, 1903); Altendorf (*Ästh. Komm.*, 1904); Blass (*Interpolationen in d. Od.*, 1904); Heubach (*Die Od. als Kunstwerk*, 1910); van Leeuwen ("De compos. Odysseae," *Mnemos.*, 1911, 13 ff., now pp. 46 ff. of his *Comm. Homericae*, 1911); Stürmer (in papers quoted above; cf. also his new work [first instalment, 1911], *Exegetische Beiträge*), and Rothe's masterly periodical summaries. This marked reaction is the outcome of a growing conviction that the poem has not had fair play, that it is entitled to be treated *als Kunstwerk* and that the poet, in Draheim's words, *muss mit Verstand gelesen, aber muss auch als Dichter verstanden werden*.

Drerup's view of the origin of the *Odyssey* (*Omero*, 245 ff.) requires special mention. He sees in it the *Märchenpoesie* of the Mycenaean Age, and assigns it in its inception to Crete. The thesis is attractive and seems not improbable, but the arguments are less convincing than Drerup's other demonstrations. The *Catalogue* (on which see Allen in *J.H.S.*, 1910, 292 ff., and *C.R.*, 1906, 193 ff.,

and Draheim, *Odysee*, 55 f.) is held to be late, Crete unknown to the *Iliad* and its heroes in that poem supernumeraries, and the ethnological document in τ 175-77 a late insertion. Cf. Cauer in *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 1 ff.

That the *Odysee* is later than the *Iliad* is a frequently expressed belief, but it is wonderful how little is to be found in the books by way of formal proof. Monro's comprehensive demonstration (*Odysee* 324 ff.) by means of alleged differences in both language and culture is the latest, and almost the only one. But there is hardly a cultural difference that has not been refuted over and over again, and Immisch's theory of more *Individualismus* and "biotic" tendency in the *Odysee* has not prevailed (*Innere Entwickl. d. griech. Epos*, 1904). Mr. Lang's essays on the polity, the religion, and the life generally in the poems, are here of special value. In regard to the language, Miss Stawell's refutation has brought discussion to a standstill. Her reply to Dr. Monro must be the ground of the next Choric effort. Meanwhile Professor Scott has clinched her rejoinder by showing, in papers such as those in *C.R.*, XXIV, 8 ff., and *C.P.*, VI, 156 ff., on the *Abstracta*, the article, and the perfects in *-κα*, that the linguistic tests depended on are useless; and "the evidence for the later date of the *Odysee* as yet is philological, not archaeological" (Seymour, *Life*, 13).

With a more general belief in the solidarity of the epics has come a healthy change in the attitude of inquirers on individual points. A more moderate tone prevails, and the desire to destroy, by analysis aiming at the detection of incongruity and the exposure of the blunderer, has given place to sober endeavor to interpret the *Realien* and to appreciate what is admittedly *Kunstepos*. Old expedients are dying out of fashion. As one example, there has been no treatise on the Repetitions since Rothe's appeal to common-sense in his *Wiederholungen*, and hardly a reply to his arguments, and since Robert's *Studien* and Fick's *Entstehung* there has been little recourse to this means of dissection. Cf. Professor Scott in *Am. J. Phil.*, XXXII, 313 ff., and see Lillge, *op. cit.*, 1 and n., on this *Umschwung* in Homeric investigation, and the essays by Zielinski, Fräulein Jordan, Plüss, Römer, and Cauer, there enumerated. Add Wittich, *Hom. in seinen Bildern* (1908); C. Schmid, *Hom. Stud.* I to III

(1905-9); Winter, *Parallelerscheinungen*, etc., in *N. Jbb.*, 1909, 682 ff. and Scott in *C.P.*, III, 91 ff., and VI, 344 ff. One might almost say, "they are all Unitarians now," and many a scholar who commenced his study of Homer imbued with the notions popular last century would echo the quaint *peccavi* of the veteran Gildersleeve (*Am. J. Phil.*, 1908, 116), "in practice I am now little better than a Unitarian." Of a more miscellaneous character are Hahn, *Stimmungen*, etc., bei *Hom.* (1906); Bernhardt, *De Alliterationis ap. Hom. usu* (1906); Meyer, *De Homeri patronymicis* (1907); Lehner, *Hom. Göttergestalten in d. antiken Plastik* (1902-6); Brachmann, *Die Gebärde bei Hom.* (1908); Wiemer, *Il. u. Od. als Quellen der Biographen Homers* (1905-8), etc.

There is a similar improvement in regard to the efforts, formerly frequent, to break up the text by "linguistic peculiarities" or to stratify it by means of tests. The discrepant results, the growing conviction as to the uniformity of the language and verse, and the positive labors of Miss Stawell and Professor Scott have helped the change, and Rothe, in his latest *Bericht*, is able to congratulate himself on the failure of a method of attack which he has resisted for a generation. Of recent years only two important works of the kind have appeared, both learned and useful in respect of the phenomena discussed, but, as dissections, mere additions to the list of Homeric *curiosa*. One is K. Witte's *Singular u. Plural* (with which cf., as to subject, Jones, *The Poetic Plur. in Gk. Trag. in the Light of Homeric Usage* (1909), and the other, Bechtel's *Vocalcontraction bei Hom.* (1908). The latter takes A, pruned of objectionable passages, as a typically early tract, and thereby provokes the retort (Cauer, *W. kl. Phil.*, 1909, 57 ff., and Rothe, *Jahresb.*, 1909, 222 ff.), that recent researches deny to that book its former claims to be considered earlier than the rest. The results of Hentze's examination of *Finalsätze* do not consist with what were considered to be established conclusions, e.g., the lateness of K (Rothe, *ibid.*, 1907, 323 ff.). On the other hand *Correption in Hiatus* (Clapp, *C.P.*, I, 239 ff.) shows no differences in late and early tracts. And when Professor Scott applies favorite tests, they fail to act as solvents.

The language is one. But what is that language in origin and character? Is it, as used to be asserted frequently and emphatically,

a *Mischmasch* and *Kunstprodukt*, a poetical dialect which was never spoken but which had been artificially elaborated for the purposes of the epic and for those alone, or was it the language of the locality in the Greek world in which the poems took their origin? The question is still being debated by the experts, and the issue must be awaited. It involves the problem of the *Urbbevölkerung* of Greece. But it may be said that the view that the Homeric dialect is a real dialect which was once spoken, but which has, from modernization during centuries of transmission, been overlaid with anomalies, is becoming the dominant belief. It has the high authority of Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, 476 ff.), and in many other discussions it seems to be tacitly assumed. Reference may be made, on the whole question, to Wackernagel, *Die griech. u. lat. Lit. u. Sprache*² (in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, 1907), 300 ff. (cf. Wilamowitz, *ibid.*, 8); Meillet, *Mém. de la Soc. de Ling. de Paris*, 1908, 165 ff.; Bréal, *Pour mieux*; Thumb, *Handbuch* (1909), 311 ff.; Hennings in *W. kl. Phil.*, 1908, 889 ff., and 1910, 483; Agar, *Homericæ*, preface, and Allen in *C.Q.*, III, 223 and *C.R.*, XXV, 21; Kretschmer in *Glotta*, I, 9 ff.; Burrows, *Discoveries*, 145 ff.; Drerup, *Omero*, 92 ff. and 215 ff.; Ridgeway, *E.A.G.*, chap. x, and Cauer, *Grdfgrn.*² 146 ff. The question also appears to be discussed in Goessler's *Kret.-Mykn. Kultur* (1907), and Heidemann's *Probleme d. griech. Urgeschichte*, I (1910).

Fick's great Aeolic theory was severely criticized from its birth, and, if one may judge from recent expressions of opinion by the experts—Thumb, Cauer, Harder, Drerup, Meillet, Monro, and others—it may be regarded as finally rejected. But κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται. If, in the struggle between Ionian and Achæan, the more ancient view of the language and content of the epics is prevailing, that is in no small measure due to the initiative of Fick and the discussions to which his hypothesis gave rise.

A theory propounded by Meister in his *Dorer u. Achæer* (1904), that the Doric inscriptions show both a dialect of the Dorian conquerors and another spoken by the subject population in Laconia, appears not to be fulfilling its early promise (Thumb, *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 385 ff.; Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1907, 335, *Omero*, 88 n., and Buck, *C.P.*, II, 245 n., with references). See also Burrows, *Discoveries*, 205; Collitz, *C.P.*, V, 510, and *The Year's Work in Class. Stud.*, 1906, 99.

It remains to mention a number of treatises and papers by the *γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη* which are the despair of the ordinary student of Homer. Schulze's famous *Quaestt. epicae* (1892) has been followed by a number of works which show results hardly proportionate to the great expenditure of erudition, and these soon to be contested by other philologists of standing. Among these the first place must be accorded to Solmsen's *Untersuchgn.* (1901; cf. Bolling in *Am. J. Phil.*, XXVIII), and Sommer's *Griech. Lautstudien* (1905). Others of the type are Danielsson's (*I.F.*, 1909) and Meillet's (*Mém. d. l. Soc. d. Ling. d. Paris*, 1909) on the Digamma, Jacobsohn's Aeolic studies in *Philol.*, 1908, and *Hermes*, 1909-10, Sommer, *Zur griech. Prosodie, Glotta*, I, 145 ff., and K. Witte's papers (in *Glotta*) on various points in the Homeric language. Ehrlich's *Zur indogerm. Sprachgeschichte* (1910), (originally in *Rhein. Mus.*, 1908, 107 ff.), contains the latest opinion on the vexed question of the Epic *Zerdehnung*. The general tendency of discussion during the last thirty years—by Wackernagel, Week, Schulze, Danielsson, Leaf, Fick, and others—has been to regard it as an effect of modernization. Ehrlich, however, finds that it was grounded in the oldest Ionic. But Kretschmer (*Glotta*, II, 341 f.) does not find his essay altogether clear and convincing, and so we must wait and hope again. Hermann's *Probe eines sprachwissenschaftl. Kommentar zu Hom.* (1908) is an interesting experiment. It applies the results of recent philology in a running commentary on the text. Stark's *Latente Sprachschatz Homers* (1908) deals with the Homeric vocabulary as it can be inferred from derivatives and compounds in the poems, but the reviewers consider the author was not quite equal to the task. And on the whole a reporter comes regretfully to the conclusion that, in spite of the prodigious industry and enviable wealth of learning displayed in these treatises, the time is not even yet ripe for a definitive work on the Homeric language. Hefermehl (*B. ph. W.*, 1909, 902) calls for such a pronouncement on Hiatus, but there seems as little approach to agreement on it as on other points.

On the metric by itself, and apart from these linguistic inquiries, in which it of course plays an important part, there have not been many recent works. Masqueray's handbook has appeared in a German translation by Pressler (1907), and Schroeder, *Vorarbeiten*

z. griech. *Versgeschichte* (1908), is against the old view of the origin of the hexameter, for which see van Leeuwen, *Enchirid.*, 8 ff., Draheim (*N. Jbb.*, 1897, 657 ff.) and Hoerenz (*De vetustiore versus heroici forma*, 1901). So also is Drewitt in *C.Q.*, II, 94 ff., an essay which embodies some most interesting conclusions, but which states a view of the origin of the epic which will hardly find acceptance till more substantial grounds are adduced. In *C.Q.*, VI, 44 ff. he has extended his investigations to the *Augment in Homer*. He still regards the "Odyssean" books as in a separate category, and adds to them Θ and part of B, and he describes the author of the *Doloneia* as "atasthalous." The description seems to be somewhat "epesbolous."

In regard to the text, old questions are argued with warmth, especially in Germany and Britain. Was there a pre-Alexandrine vulgate in addition to the debased texts which the papyri show to have existed, and what was the precise nature of the Aristarchean operations on it? The view that there was such a vulgate, and that Aristarchus faithfully adhered to it, is held by the Ludwich school, which includes many prominent Homerists. Of late years it has been stoutly contested, most recently by Professor Murray in a new chapter, 298 ff., in *R.G.E.*², the argument in which is that the fluid state of the text in the third century B.C. is fatal to the belief that the poems were written by one great poet in the eleventh. The proposition sounds somewhat "bold and peremptory." See also Caer, *Grdfgrn.*², 34 ff. and 54 ff.; Drerup, *Omero*, 20 n. with references; Terzaghi, *Atene e Roma*, 1909, 232, and Römer's papers on Aristarchus and his work in *Rhein. Mus.* 1906 and 1911, and ("Die neueste Offenbarung üb. Ar.") in Belzner, *Hom. Probleme*, I, 1911. A reviewer in *Athenaeum*, 1911, 239, complains that the matter is not satisfactorily dealt with in "Homer" in the new *Encycl. Brit.* There is a report in *Bursian*, 1908, on publications issued up to that year. Others are Wecklein's useful *Methode d. Textkritik* (1908), Bachmann's *Ästhet. Anschauungen Aristarchs* (1902-4), and an important paper by Allen on the Text of the *Odyssey* in *Papers of the Brit. School at Rome*, 1910. Some new fragments of Θ, P, and Ψ are published, with copious commentary, in Gerhard's *Ptolemäische Homerfragm.* (1911). Agar's numerous emendations of the

text of the *Odyssey* in his *Homerica* (1908) have been variously criticized. The work undoubtedly contains much valuable elucidation of Homeric practice by careful collation of particulars. Editions of the poems do not come within the scope of the present notice. It is enough to say that here, as elsewhere, the critics have their irreconcilable differences, to be seen in the reviews—Ludwich on Cauer, Cauer on Monro, Monro on Platt, and so on—when new editions appear. The main point is the value to be attached to the tradition and the results of modern philological research respectively.

The *Realien* present as fruitful and as hopeful a source of inquiry as the language. Excavation has of course added greatly to the interest of the culture in the poems. In regard to the armor, much progress has been made since the well-known works of Helbig, Reichel, and Robert were published. As pioneer handbooks to Mycenaean antiquities, the two former had in their day a high value; in so far as they touched the question of the origin of the poems, the two latter are already regarded as failures. Neither Reichel's *Homer* (carefully edited) = Mycenae, nor Robert's fantastical dissection of the *Iliad* has been accepted. Professor Bolling ("Homeric Armor and Mr. Lang," *Cathol. Univ. Bulletin*, 1910, 669 ff.) can still say a word for the Robertian scheme, and even credits its author with "an unusual degree" of "sobriety of judgment." But that is just what the critics, even in his own country, found that Robert's book lacked. Its marvelous power of analysis everyone admitted.

Investigation has now been carried much farther, by Hofmann, *Aristarchs Studien* (1905); Ostern, *Bewaffnung in Homers IL*. (1909); Lippold, *Zu den Schildformen der Alten* (1908) and pp. 399 ff. of *Münchener archäol. Stud. z. Andenk. Furtwänglers* (1909); Belzner, *Hom. Probleme* (1911), 24 ff.; Drerup, *Omero*, 240 ff., and above all, Mr. Lang's works. Here, as elsewhere, the mania of distrust and the interpolation *lues* have yielded to a more reasonable spirit. Professor Murray still clings to the Reichelian interpretation of such passages as Δ 129 ff., H 251, etc. Mr. Lang, Miss Stawell, Professor Shorey (*C.P.*, VI, 238), and others have shown a better way. On the shield much interesting information is to be found in Reinach's *Itanos et l' "Inventio Scuti"* (1910).

Funeral rites exhibit, as is well known, a discrepancy between the poems and the sub-Mycenaean epoch to which some would refer them. Dörpfeld, in *Mélanges Nicole* and elsewhere, has propounded the theory ("ingenious and attractive," Burrows) that the Greeks never burned corpses, but only scorched them before burial. Drerup (*Omero*, 177 n.) and others have remarked on the absence of corroboration in literature and in the graves. But Cauer (*Grdfgrn.*², 278) accepts the solution heartily, and Draheim (*W. kl. Phil.*, 1905, 1325 ff. cf. 1213 ff.) thinks it highly probable. Others are in opposition. Some, while admitting the difficulty, make light of it. One says as the Homeric heroes died in a foreign land, a temporary change of custom is easily conceivable (Drerup, *op. cit.*, and Lichtenberg, *Ägäische Kultur*, 33); others that cremation is an old established Indo-Germanic custom (Poulsen, *Dipylongräber*, 1905; Rouge, *N. Jbb.*, 1910, 385 ff., and Zehetmaier, *Leichenverbrennung etc. im alten Hellas*, 1907), and that it may also "start among any early people as a happy thought"—to keep *les revenants* away. See Burrows, *Discoveries*, 210 ff.; Leaf's *Introduction to Schuchhardt*, and Lang, *World of Homer*, chap. xi. To these it need only be added that indications are not wanting in graves examined that cremation was not unknown in early Aegean days. See Zehetmaier, *op. cit.*; *The Year's Work in Class. Stud.*, 1906-8; Seymour, *Life*, 479; Cauer, *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 7. Belzner, *op. cit.*, admits the existence of evidence of cremation in Mycenaean times, but prefers, on an indication from Assarlik in Caria (of a date "nearer Mycenaean than Dipylon") to regard the practice as established only in the Ionian epoch, when the epos transferred it from its own day to the heroic age which it set itself to describe. In any case, he notes, the data of the poems are a good voucher for the perfect unity of the poetical conception. On the subject generally see O. Schrader, *Begrabung u. Verbrennen* (1910), and Lawson, *Mod. Greek Folklore*, etc. (1910), chap. v.; and cf. Frazer, *Pausanias*, III, 155, and Cauer, *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 8. On the similarities and differences between the Mycenaean culture and that in the poems there is an excellent statement in Hogarth's *Authority and Archaeology* (1899), 245 ff.

Studies of the exact arrangement of what used to be called the "Homeric House" were formerly frequent and elaborate. Differ-

ences discovered between the various tenements described by Homer, and between these and the palaces which have been unearthed in the Aegean, were used against the poems. Variations from an ideal type were suspicious. There is a statement on the subject in Dr. Monro's *Odyssey*, 489 ff. One of the latest is Mr. Lang's *World of Homer*, chap. x, where Noack's *Homerische Paläste* (1903) is criticized. See also Cauer, *Grdfgrn.*², 275, and Belzner, *op. cit.*, 48 ff. The latter emphasizes the *Einheitlichkeit der Schilderung* in the poems on this as on other cultural points. Interest has now been transferred to a new strife, as to the structural relation of the Cretan palaces to those at Tiryns and Mycenae. This controversy is to a great extent ethnological, and bound up with the larger question as to the origin of the Aegean race. The Germans generally say that is to be found in the North; Britons that the *incunabula* are to be looked for in Africa. See especially Mackenzie in *B.S.A.*, XI to XIV; Dörpfeld in *Ath. Mitt.* XXX and XXXII; Noach, *Ovalhaus u. Palast in Kreta* (1908), on which Bulle in *B. ph. W.*, 1910, 1258 ff.; Burrows, *op. cit.* 78 ff.; Engelmann in *B. ph. W.*, 1907, 85 ff.; Cauer, *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 1 ff.; Schuchhardt, *ibid.*, 1908, 321, and Drerup, *Omero*, 138 ff., 150. The discussion, which has not a very direct bearing on the Homeric problem, is still proceeding, and Dr. Mackenzie is apparently to write a further paper, which will no doubt provide a convenient summary of fact and argument.

In other departments of the culture there is not much to record. Seymour's great and comprehensive work on the *Realien* met with a very handsome reception, though some reviewers criticized the author's attitude to the Homeric Question as failing in definiteness. Keller's *Homeric Society* (1902) was a careful compilation of the social phenomena. Bonner's paper on the "Admn. of Justice" (*C.P.*, VI, 12 ff.) is a model of what such summaries should be. The facts are catalogued and estimated as they come, and there are no assumptions of interpolation and contamination. *Nullius in verba jurat*. The result is a picture of a harmonious whole. Under religion there is little special to Homer except P. Meyer's *Götterwelt Homers* (1907). The women of Homer are treated in Koch's *Zur Stellung d. Frau* (1909) and Pestalozza's *Homers Frauen-Gestalten* (1911). Others are Holsten's *Griech. Sittlichkeit in myken. Zeit* (1908),

P. Hofmann's work on Aristarchus already quoted, and Körner's *Wesen u. Wert d. homn. Heilkunde* (1904).

The Cretan and Mycenaean cultures are described in many treatises. Excavation has yielded a rich store of material, the sifting of which has produced great diversity of opinion. The origin of the Mediterranean race—whether Aryan, non-Aryan, Northern or "Carian"—the ethnological connections of the Achaeans and the time and manner of their coming, the part played by the Phoenicians, who are lifting their heads after a period of depression, the relation of the Aegean civilization to the Danubian in the north and the Hittite in the east, and to the culture described by Homer, the coming of the Dorians, if they ever did come, and the influences that combined to bring about the *Printemps de la Grèce* in Ionia, are among the matters debated by the archaeologists. In addition to the well-known works of Tsountas and Manatt, Perrot and Chipiez, Hall, Bérard, Champault, Burrows, Ridgeway, Mosso, Lagrange and Dussaud, Hogarth and Mr. and Mrs. Hawes, the following may be noted: Fimmen, *Zeit u. Dauer d. kretn.-mykn. Kultur* (1909); Hall, E. H., *The Decorative Art of Crete in the Bronze Age* (1906); Holsten and Poulsen, *ut supra*; Assmann, "Zur Vorgesch. von Kreta" (*Philol.*, 1908, 161 ff.); Kropp, *Die minoisch-myken. Kult. im Lichte d. Überliefg. bei Herodot* (1905); Wilamowitz, *Ionische Wanderung* (1906); Lichtenberg, *Die ägäische Kultur* (1911) and *Einflüsse d. äg. Kult. auf Ägypten u. Palästina* (1911); Vollgraff, "Alter d. Neolith-Kultur in Kreta" (*Rhein. Mus.*, LXIII); Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, I (1909), and many other publications; Aly, "Karer u. Leleger" (*Philol.*, 1909, 428 ff.); Penka, *Vorhellen. Bevölkerung Griechenlands* (1911, with a profusion of references); Drerup, *Omero*, 98 f., 105 ff., and *passim*; Fick, *Vorgriech. Ortsnamen* (1905), and *Hattiden u. Danubier* (1909); Meister, *ut sup.*; Goessler, "Kret.-myken. Kultur" (*Preuss. Jahrb.*, 1907, 453 ff.); Inama, *Omero nell' età Micen.* (1907); Myres, "A History of the Pelasgian Theory" (*J.H.S.*, 1908, 170 ff.) and *The Dawn of History* (1911); Ridgeway, "Minos the Destroyer," etc. (*Proc. Brit. Acad.*, 1909), and "Who Were the Dorians?" (*Anthropol. Essays presd. to E. B. Tylor*, 1907); Frazer, *Pausanias*, III, 155 ff. and V, 551 ff.; *The Year's Work in Class. Stud.*, the *Annals of the B.S.A.* and other archaeological

publications. The work by Mr. Seager on Pseira and that of Miss Boyd and others on Gournia appear to contain very valuable matter. For a report on the excavations of 1907-9 see A. J. Reinach, "Les fouilles de Crète 1907-9" (*Journ. d. Savs.*, 1909). On the questions raised by the Thessalian excavations see *The Year's Work*, 1910, 145 ff. The Homeric student notes how, in this wealth of material, the archaeologist proper, as distinguished from him who has been styled "the armchair critic," is accepting more and more the epics as a cultural unit—an ancient sub-Mycenaean unit, whether given final shape in Ionia or not. He seems but rarely to contemplate the possibility of piecemeal composition and manipulation through centuries, with the finishing touch put by a *Bearbeiter*, or of the late poet suggested by Professor Murray—a poet who, by the application of "a good deal of simple cunning," which is also described as "gentle and lowly service" to the epics of Greece, built up from the poetry about Troy "the greatest poem that ever sounded on the lips of men."

The literature of that most interesting document, the *Disk of Phaistos*, is given in the Appendix.

On Troy and its topography Dörpfeld's monumental work is the authority; cf. Cauer, *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 6, and Drerup, *Omero*, 116. There are still difficulties as to the plain, especially the rivers, which (with the gates) are discussed by Robert, *Hermes*, 1907, 78 ff.; Busse, "Schauplatz d. Kämpfe vor Troja," *N. Jbb.*, 1907, 457 ff., and Obst, "Skamander-Xanthus," *Klio*, 1909, 200 ff. See also Della Seta, *Appunti di Topografia Omerica* (1908). Drerup, *op. cit.*, 231, 250, is satisfied with Rothe that the poet knew the plain from personal observation, but took a poet's liberty with the topography for purposes of the action. The discussions of ἐν ἀπιστερά may be recalled. A final solution may be had by a second Bérard "saturated with the *Iliad*" working on the spot. Gruhn, *Die Lage d. Stadt Troja* (1909), rejects Hissarlik and points to ruins at Duden. This is but one instalment (seven have appeared) of a great work on the *Schauplatz d. Il. u. Od.*, which has not been favorably received. See the *Wochenschriften*, 1910-11. Bötticher's *Trojanische Humbug* (1911) is a polemic against Dörpfeld, and the revival apparently of an old dispute. See Schuchhardt, *Schliemann's Excavns.*, 324 ff.

On the Odyssean geography not much has been written since Bérard's great work, which proved that the poet described voyagings in a real world. Nestle, in a paper reported by Rothe, "Odysseelandschaften" (*Südwest Schulbl.*, 1910, 14 ff.), seems to be still skeptical, and Hennings, "Die Heimat d. Phäaken" (*Z. f. d. österr. Gym.*, 1910, 97 ff.), places that people, with Champault (*Phéniciens et Grecs*, 1906), in Ischia, not in Coreyra (Bérard).

Gemoll's *Hom. Schiffskatalog* (1904) maintains the originality of that much-discussed document against the one in the *Cypria*. The important defense by Allen has been mentioned above. The faithful "portrayal of a state of things, political and topographical, which never recurred in later history," and which no one could have invented, "is written all over the document." See also his illuminating paper on the "Great Appellatives," "Argos in Homer" (*C.Q.*, III, 81 ff.). These have been utilized by Della Seta (*Achaiōi etc. nei poemi Omerici*, *Rendic. Accad. Linc.*, XVI) for one more dissection of the poems, but his conclusions have been effectively refuted by Zuretti in *Riv. d. Filol.*, XXXVI, 232 ff.

On the great, interesting, and evenly debated question of Leucas-Ithaca, some references are collected in the Appendix. It appears that Dörpfeld is about to publish a work on the whole subject.

In regard to the Saga, Drerup has given us, in his work frequently quoted above, a disquisition of the first importance. Differing especially from Niese (*Entwicklung*, 1882) and Usener (*Stoff d. griechn. Epos*, 1897), he denies that the Saga was ever rooted in the *Göttermythus*. Historical events are its basis. For the Trojan cycle he points to the early struggles of the Aeolian settlers in the Troad, which may date from the third millennium B.C. The discussion (on which cf. Cauer, *N. Jbb.*, 1905, 5) is careful and reasoned, an important feature being the consideration of the epopees of many other nations, following Comparetti's famous treatise on the *Kalewala*. It has a useful supplement in Heusler's *Lied u. Epos* (1905). Development from the lay was consummated by the appearance of the epic poet, when the popular bard and popular poetry were eclipsed.

Of *Sagenverschiebungen* the chief exponent is E. Bethe in his *Hom. u. d. Heldensage* (1902), *Troian. Ausgrabn.* (1904), and *Mythus*,

Sage, Märchen (1905). Other similar efforts are Oldfather's "Lok-rika" (*Philol.*, 1908, 411 ff.); Staehlin's *Hypoplakische Theben* (1907), Vürtheim's *De Aiakis orig. cult. patria* (1907), and Girard's *Ajax fils de Telamon* (1905). Sad havoc is played with the heroes of the *Troica*, their nature and identity, their countries and their exploits. For a scathing criticism of these essays see Otto Crusius, *Sagenverschiebungen* (1906), who claims E. Meyer and Dörpfeld as adherents of his view, which also has the concurrence of Drerup. Crusius recommends their authors to have more regard to *recte legere* and *recte intellegere*. Evidence is necessary to warrant such startling conclusions. *Möglichkeit*, as Ludwig's golden saying puts it, *ist nicht Notwendigkeit*. For the Odysseus-Saga we may mention Walter's *Odysee u. d. Odysseussage* (reported in *Die Saalburg*, 1909); Menrad's *Urmythus d. Odyssee* (1910, unfavorably reviewed), and Croiset's *Observns. sur la légende primitive d'Ulysse* (1910). The Cretan Saga is dealt with in Bethe's "Minos" (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1910, 200 ff.). An Achaean verse-chronicle is postulated by Mr. Allen in "Dictys of Crete and Homer" (*J. Phil.*, XXXI, 207 ff.).

Some subsidiary topics that formerly loomed large in Homeric discussion need only be glanced at. The Pisistratean "myth" (Monro) is one. Cauer has reaffirmed his belief in it, and so has Professor Murray in a meager statement—which ignores Monro's demonstration—in his new chapter. Pisistratus as maker of the poems has been put out of action. Many are ready to allow that he *may have* arranged for a recension of the text. Rothe goes so far. But when Murray (*Oxford Mag.*, 1911, 157) claims him as "thoroughly convinced by the Pisistratus tradition," he makes a very misleading statement. There has always been a regrettable tendency to vagueness in discussions and conclusions in this matter. The real tradition and mythological accretions have not been kept apart (Allen in *C.R.*, XXI, 18). The Cyclics have also disappeared from the field. Dr. Monro, Mr. Lang, and Mr. Allen have fixed their position and character, which are now assumed by Homerists to have been established. They are late, inferior imitators of the epics. The *personalia* do not in these days receive much attention. There is a revival of interest in Maass's "Die Person Homers" (*N. Jbb.*, 1911, 539 ff.).

To conclude. Belief has now come round to the old orthodox view. There was a poet Homer, who composed the great bulk of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Accretions have been reduced to small dimensions. Scholars differ in their views as to their limits, but are generally agreed as to the unity of the mass, and that it was composed on the mainland in Achæan, or sub-Mycenæan, times. Whether the poems have come down to us from that epoch unchanged save as to some small additions and much surface modernization, or whether mere lays of Achæan origin were made into the epics by Homer in Ionia, seems to be the great issue that remains. On this point opinion is divided. Those who still bring the composition of the poems down to historical times, as Mulder, Murray, and Bréal, appear to be in a very small minority. It seems likely that this view, rejected by leading Homerists and especially by those who busy themselves with archaeology, will ere long be entirely forgotten, and that the simple issue will be, Achæan or Ionian? On this point conclusions are much influenced by the individual attitude on the question how far, if at all, archaizing is to be detected in the poems. Much has been written about this of recent years, and opinions are extraordinarily diverse. References would fill pages. There is a useful statement in Seymour's *Life in the Homeric Age*, 19 ff. To those who accept Mr. Lang's proof of the unity of the culture described, and his position, which has very strong backing, that early poets do not archaize, the question is settled. Mr. Allen, however, has quite recently stated the view for Ionia in *C.R.*, XXV, 233 ff. It may be hoped that this paper will lead to a wide discussion and a definite finding. That the controversy has been so far advanced and the issue thus narrowed is mainly due to concentration on the Homeric language and culture. Discussion has never been more active than now, but it no longer presents (in Cauer's words, written in 1905) *ein Bild rastloser Bewegung*. It has steadied itself, taken a thought, and—rallied to the Unitarian view. It is only a few years since Murray could dismiss Lang's *Homer and His Age* in a few haughty sentences, and Cauer could refuse to regard it at all. If one compares that attitude with the cordial reception given to Rothe's work on the *Iliad* and Draheim's on the *Odyssey* (*mit aufrichtiger Freude zu begrüßen!*—Bethe in *D.L.Z.*, 1911,

2588), one has a measure of the revulsion that has taken place. Wilamowitz' *ein Wille eines Mannes* and Mülder's *den Dichter als Dichter begreifen* sum up the present situation. It is full of hope.

APPENDIX

1. THE ITHACA-LEUCAS QUESTION. **1902:** Paulatos, Η ΑΛΗΘΗΣ ΙΘΑΚΗ (2d ed., Athens); Michael, H., *Das hom. u. d. heutige. Ith.* (Jauer). **1903:** Draheim, *Die Ithaka Frage* (Berlin); Menge, R., *Ith. nach eigener Anschauung* (2d ed. Gütersloh); Reissinger, K., *Leukas, d. hom. Ithaka* (Bl. f. d. GSW., 369 ff.); Döring, A., *Eine Frühlingsreise in Griechenland* (Frankfurt a. M.). **1904:** Gössler, P., *Leukas-Ith. d. Heimat d. Odysseus* (Stuttgart). **1905:** Michael, *Heimat d. Odysseus* (Jauer; cf. *W. kl. Phil.*, 1305 ff., 1333 ff.); *Zugabe z. 76. Jahresb. d. Gym. Barmen*; Lang, G., *Untersuchgn. z. Geogr. der Od.* (Karlsruhe); Dörpfeld, *Leukas, zwei Aufsätze* (Athens); Rothe in *Jahresb. d. phil. Ver.*, 162 ff.; Salvator, L., *Sommertage auf Ith.* (Prag); Vollgraff, W., "Fouilles d'Ithaque" (*Bull. d. Corr. Hell.*, 145 ff.); Cauer (N. Jbb., 1 ff.). **1906:** Gruhn, A., "Ithaka" (N. ph. Rundsch., 553 f.); Paulatos, Η ΠΑΤΡΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΩΣ (Athens; cf. *B. ph. W.*, 1907, 1569 ff.; *W. kl. Phil.*, 1908, 1051 ff.); Draheim, "Gegenw. Stand d. Ithaka-Frage" (*W. kl. Phil.*, 1351 ff.); von Marées, W., "Die Ithakalegende" (N. Jbb., 233 ff.); Reissinger, "Zur Leukas-Ithaka-Frage" (Bl. f. d. GSW., 497 ff.); Sitzler, J., *Ästh. Komm. z. Od.* 172 ff.; Dörpfeld, *Zweiter Brief* (Athens); Rothe in *Jahresb.*, 232 ff. **1907:** Gröschl, J., *Dörpfelds Leukas-Ithaka Hypoth.* (Friedek; cf. *B. ph. W.*, 1908, 656); Reissinger, "Neue Literat. z. Leukas-Ithaka" (Bl. f. d. GSW., 466 ff.); Vollgraff, W., "Dulichion-Leukas" (N. Jbb., 617 ff.); Bethe, E., "Ith. u. Leukas" (*Rhein. Mus.*, 326 f.); Partsch, J., "Das Alter d. Inselnatur von Leukas" (*Petermanns Mitt.*; cf. *W. kl. Phil.*, 1908, 1081 ff.); Rothe in *Jahresb.*, 276 ff.; Dörpfeld, *Dritter Brief* (Athens); von Marées, *Karten von Leukas* (Berlin; cf. *B. ph. W.*, 1908, 616 ff.; *W. kl. Phil.*, 1907, 561 ff.); Gössler, "Die Dörpfeldschen Ausgrabgn." (*W. kl. Phil.*, 1073 ff.); Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, 69 ff. **1908:** Dörpfeld, *Vierter Brief*; Goekoop, A. E. H., *Ithaque la grande* (Athens; cf. *B. ph. W.*, 1909, 403 ff.; *W. kl. Phil.*, 1909, 510 ff.); Thomopoulos, J. I., *Ith. u. Homer*, I. (Athens; cf. *W. kl. Phil.*, 1909, 761 ff.); Paulatos, Η ΟΜΗΡΙΚΗ ΙΘΑΚΗ (Athens; cf. *B. ph. W.*, 1909, 1169 ff.); Engel, E., "Die Streitfrage Ithaka-Leukas" (*Voss. Zeitg.*, Nos. 323, 335); Braun, R., *Sommertage in Griechenland* (Hagen); Finsler, *Homer*, 188 ff.; Cserép, J., *Homeros Ithakeja* (cf. *W. kl. Phil.*, 1909, 316 ff.). **1909:** Rothe in *Jahresb.* 185 ff.; Cauer, *Grdfgrn.*², 238 ff.; Dörpfeld, "Fünfter Brief," and "Zur Ithakafrage" (*W. kl. Phil.*, 1185 ff.); Robert, *Hermes*, 623 ff.; Hennings in *B. ph. W.*, 1169 (with references to previous essays). **1910:** Herkenrath, E., ΔΟΥΑΙΧΙΟΝ ΤΕ ΣΑΜΗ (*B. ph. W.*, 1236 ff., 1269 ff.); Rothe in *Jahresb.*, 349 ff., and *Ilias als Dichtung*, 119 ff.; Gercke, A., in *B. ph. W.*, 189 ff.;

Drerup, *Omero*, 246 ff. (cf. *B. ph. W.*, 1911, 289 f.); Draheim, *Od. als Kunstwerk*, 56 ff. **1911**: Rüter, H., *Mit Dörpfeld nach Leukas-Ith.* (Halberstadt); Miller, W., in *C.P.*, VI. 105; Dörpfeld and Herkenrath in *Athen. Mitt.* 207 ff., 212 ff.

2. THE DISK OF PHAISTOS. **1909**: Della Seta, *Il Disco di Phaistos* (Rome); Pernier, "Il Disco di Phaistos" (*Ausonia*, 255 ff.); Meyer, Ed., "Der Diskos von Phaistos" (*Sitzgsb. d. kön. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, XLI); Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, I. 22 ff., 273 ff. **1910**: Reinach, A. J., *Le Disque de Phaistos* (Paris). **1911**: Hempl, G., "The Solving of an Ancient Riddle" (*Harper's Mag.*, 187 ff.); Stawell, F. M., "An Interpretation of the Phaistos Disk" (*Burlington Mag.*, 23 ff.); *Morning Post*, April 8 and 14; Gössler in *W. kl. Phil.*, 1107 f.; Griffith, J., "Mediterranean Civilisn. and the Phaestos Riddle" (*Nature*, 385 ff.); Cuny in *Rev. d. Études Anciennes*, 296 ff.; Hall in *J.H.S.*, 119 ff. For some other references see *The Year's Work in Class. Stud.*, 1909, 15 n., and 1910, 149 f.